

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                         | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO |  |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|-----------------|--|
| 09/669,897                              | 09/27/2000      | Jun Ibuki            | 826.1628/JDH        | 4426            |  |
| 21171                                   | 7590 01/23/2006 |                      | EXAM                | EXAMINER        |  |
| STAAS & HALSEY LLP                      |                 |                      | RIMELL, SAMUEL G    |                 |  |
| SUITE 700<br>1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. |                 |                      | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER    |  |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20005                    |                 |                      | 2164                |                 |  |

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.   | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|
|  | 09/669,897  | IBUKI ET AL.  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |  |  |  |
|  | Sam Rimell  | 2164  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appropriate appropriate for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c  | orrespondence address   |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).   | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  (6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim  ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONED | L. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |
| Status   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on  2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☑ This  3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under Expression is the practice of the practic | action is non-final.<br>ice except for formal matters, pro  |   |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |   |   |  |  |  |
| 4)  Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5)  Claim(s) 3-10 is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 1, 2, 11, 12 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers  9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10)  The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceeding a constant of the december of the propers are subjected to by the Examiner  | election requirement.  cepted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See   | 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |  |  |  |
| 11) $\square$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |   |   |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |   |   |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of  | have been received. have been received in Application ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   | on No d in this National Stage d.   |  |  |  |
| •  |   | SAM RIMELL  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |   | PRIMARY EXAMINER  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | 4) Interview Summary ( Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:  | te  |  |  |  |

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Paik et al. (U.S. Patent 6,148,312).

Claim 1: Reference is made to FIG. 4. Step (402) involves the extraction and examination of text (contents of articles) and text fact data (metadata). The metadata has at least three parts: (1) target object (article content in the metadata—col. 6, line 43): (2) an attribute name (the title of the article in the metadata—col. 6, line 42: and (3) an attribute value (versions of the article which are archived—col. 3, lines 15-16).

As seen in FIG. 4 step (404-406), articles which are missing metadata will have metadata created for that article. This is a grouping of data (metadata) with an article. Doing this step for all the articles is a step of data aggregation. The complete resulting set of information, including all metadata, corrected articles and non-corrected articles form an aggregated data set.

As seen in FIG. 4 step (408), the system detects an inconsistent data group (metadata that lacks an associated article of information) by scanning data set after aggregation (404-406) has occurred. The system then erases the erroneous metadata and determines the remaining data to be correct by proceeding to the "Return" step. The Delete Metadata" step aids in unifying the correct metadata with the correct article.

Page 3

<u>Claim 2:</u> Step (402) is the data extraction unit. Metadata extracted includes target object (article content); attribute name (title of article) and attribute value (versions of article which have been archived). Step (406) is the data aggregating unit since it creates new metadata when it does exist and aggregates the data with each article. All the resulting data is the "one data set". Step (408) is the inconsistency detecting unit which detects metadata that is not associated with an article. The correctness determining unit is the process step "Return" since only correct metadata associated with correct articles are determined to exist at this step. The data integrating unit is the "Delete Metadata" step since this step aids in integrating only the correct metadata with the correct articles by deleting metadata lacking any association with an article.

Claim 11: See remarks for claim 1.

<u>Claim 12:</u> See remarks for claim 1. Note that the grouped fact data is completed at steps (404-406) so the inconsistency detection step (408) must occur on the grouped fact data.

Claims 3-10 are allowed.

## Remarks

Applicant's arguments and amendments have been entered and considered.

Claim 1: Applicant's primary argument is that the aggregated data set is that data set which is formed from extracted data, not a combination of extracted fact data and text. This argument has been considered, but is not consistent with what is being claimed. Claim 1 calls for ".. at least one aggregated data set from the extracted fact data.". This limitation does not state that the aggregated data excludes combinations of extracted data and text data, it only states that the aggregated includes at least some extracted data. In Paik et al., the aggregated data set created at steps 404-406 include the extracted data (contents of articles) and, when necessary,

newly created text data (metadata) which are aggregated together. This is consistent with what is being currently claimed. The aggregated data set also includes articles which already have metadata, so in this alternate case, both the article data and metadata are the extracted data.

Applicant also argues that Paik et al. does not disclose the extracted data including target object, attribute name and attribute value. This argument is not correct. Each of these features are taught in Paik et al., as outlined in greater detail on page 2, in the first paragraph of the discussion for claim 1.

Claim 2: Applicant argues that the articles which are extracted and examined in step (402) do not constitute a "data set". This argument is of correct. An article contains information and that information constitutes data. The descriptions of the article (metatdata), such as the title of the article or version of the article also constitute data.

Applicant argues that Paik et al. does not disclose the two separate operations of detecting inconsistency and determining correctness/incorrectness. This argument is not correct for two reasons. First, claim 2 is addressed to an apparatus and not a method, so it is not actually claiming operations (method steps), but are claiming individual sets of instructions. Secondly, Paik et al. has two separate instructions which meet the claimed limitations. Paik et al. has an instruction for inconsistency detection at (step 408, detecting articles without metadata) and a correctness determining instruction ("return"—returns only a set of correct metadata associated with correct articles).

Claims 11: Applicant's arguments for this claim reflect those arguments which were already presented for claim 2.

Application/Control Number: 09/669,897 Page 5

Art Unit: 2175

Claim 12: Applicant argues that Paik et al. does not disclose any form of scanning operation on grouped fact data. This argument is moot. Claim 12 contains no mention of scanning information.

This rejection is made in response to an RCE request and is made non-final.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Sam Rimell at

telephone number (571) 272-4084

Sam Rimell

**Primary Examiner** 

Art Unit 2164